



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Traube the *Aetas Ovidiana*, when Ovid's intense popularity resulted in the elaborate glossing and collating and contaminating of his text. . . . We need first a more thorough scouring of the *selva oscura* of glosses and classes. Then will be the time for some scholar with the genius and fine taste of Heinsius to make on the basis of ample and rationally sifted material a really critical edition of the *Metamorphoses*. For the present, the thesaurus of textual material which Magnus has accumulated after <25> years of patient toil will be an indispensable source of information for the critic and should stimulate research.

Professor Slater is even more severe than Professor Rand in his discussion of Magnus's work. He sums up as follows (60):

. . . I have used the book with increasing disappointment and distrust. A record—let alone an *editio critica*—should be faithful to the facts. Magnus has been overwhelmed by the mere mass of his material—'mole ruit sua'. . . . the book contains far too much slipshod and inaccurate work, together with a certain number of puerile errors. The unwieldy bulk of it and the outrageously large proportion of unimportant matter in the *app. crit.* are bound to tell heavily against it. . . . One cannot help wishing that Magnus had attempted less. With a narrower scope and greater vigilance he might have come much nearer than he does to that finality to which in the *Praefatio* he admits that he aspired.

Professor Slater thinks that the four volumes of Burmann's *Ovidii Opera Omnia* give better notes and after all a better apparatus criticus than we find in Magnus's edition.

C. K.

(To be concluded)

### DOES LATIN 'FUNCTION'?

During the period, now happily drawing to a close, in which many were persuaded that the findings of experimental psychology supported the palpable fallacy 'We train <only> what we train', a great deal was written about 'dead-ends' in the High School course of study. Dr. Eliot, in particular, was fond of hurling this indictment against subjects such as algebra and Latin.

And, granting the premises, such indictment is logical enough. For, if the mind is made up of little water-tight compartments, and training in one compartment does not spread to another, then two years' training in algebra or Latin would have no value, except as they prepared the student for later use of algebra or Latin; and, inasmuch as most students cease to apply their algebraic knowledge, or to read much Latin, after completing the High School course, these subjects would become mere dead-ends, the time spent upon them being thrown away.

It is a pleasure to know that psychologists of note are now beginning to take sharp issue with those who publish such notions. As a matter of fact, the mind is not divided into small water-tight compartments; rather, its functions are inextricably bound together, thus providing for transfer of training at innumerable points. Hence a study may be so rich, through the

transferable training it gives, that its place in the curriculum is abundantly justified, even though the student, after graduation, may not pursue work directly along the same lines.

Thus, after the tumult caused by the 'Modern School' and its fallacies, we come back again to the solid ground of common sense. Those who wish to know at first hand how the situation appears from the point of view of experimental psychology are referred to a brief and clearly written treatise by Professor G. M. Stratton, of the University of California<sup>1</sup>.

Under these circumstances, it is painful and surprising to find a teacher of Latin so anxious to advance ideas of his own predilection that he attempts to use even this outworn dead-end argument to discredit present methods of teaching Latin. Listen to the following:

. . . But how long would the study of the piano, for example, retain its present enormous numbers of devotees, if it were known and understood that upon the termination of the last formal lesson the actual practice of the art would cease? But is not that precisely the incontrovertible fact regarding the students of Latin? Is it not true that even assuming that they gain an actual reading power over the language, the last assigned lesson in the last Latin course constitutes for the vast majority their last practice in the art? But continued use of an art is the only justification for its acquisition<sup>2</sup>.

Presented without context, these words would not unnaturally be taken to be an excerpt from some old diatribe of Dr. Flexner or Dr. Eliot. The introduction of the comparison with music is palpably unfair. For, while many might be willing to admit that the study of music under the conditions here described would be a real dead-end, the case is far different with subjects like algebra and Latin, with their abundant and measurable transfer of training.

It should be added, further, that some courses of study or training yield additional results that are more elusive and hard to define and measure. The experience gained through them changes the mental outlook, and the people who have had the experience are not quite the same persons they would have been otherwise. Here are factors that thus far have been given too little attention. Indeed I am inclined to believe that Professor Stratton would not be ready to admit that training in music, even under the limitations above indicated, is necessarily a dead-end. At any rate he says<sup>3</sup>:

. . . Those especially should try to sing who have no promise of voice, those painters who never will be able to paint. Youthful attempts at the violin and sketching which come to nothing, I can testify, may make music and landscape constant sources of delight. Not, then, by their fruits visible to others are those childhood practices to be judged, but by what they leave behind concealed in the permanent springs of appreciation.

<sup>1</sup>Developing Mental Power (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1922).

<sup>2</sup>The Classical Journal 17 (1921), 54.

<sup>3</sup>47-48. In this connection we may note, too, the rather clever retort of a lady to the dead-end argument, namely that, without question, she had received benefit from certain sermons the contents of which she could no longer recite (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.208).

The question, Does Latin Function?, is approached from another angle by the same Latin teacher<sup>4</sup>:

All this is on the assumption that the ability to read Latin is actually acquired. But that the great majority (probably 99 per cent) of the half million pupils now studying Latin in our secondary schools will never learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term is an obvious fact, too patent to require demonstration. . . .

Here is another shaft from the 'Modern School' armory, as is seen particularly in the liberal estimate "probably 99 per cent". One wonders, too, just what is meant by "learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term".

In the mouth of a professed educationalist, knowing little Latin and still less of the actual class-room problem, the phrase is apt to signify ability to handle at sight any stray bit of Latin selected without regard for the student's preparation, and unprovided with a context.

Such groundless assumption is doubtless fostered by the complacent impression that a year or two spent upon a Modern Language in the Public Schools will enable the fortunate student to hold his own in the country to which the language is indigenous. But there is strong reason for belief that there is nothing unique in the experience of the traveller who, on returning from abroad, said of his linguistic equipment that the only trouble was that the natives did not know French when they heard it!

From the point of view of one who knows anything about it, it is simply preposterous to expect children who have had two or three years of Latin to deal offhand with anything an 'investigator' cares to throw at their heads. Some years ago a selfappointed expert with more zeal than knowledge devised a test! He unearthed the aphorism, *Studium discendi voluntate quae cogi non potest constat*<sup>5</sup>. This he carried about in his vest-pocket, and, wherever he encountered anyone who had had at least one year of Latin at some time or other, he poked it at him. Finding that many were puzzled by the sentence, he raised the triumphant cry that he had proved "scientifically" that "Latin does not function"<sup>6</sup>.

The childish absurdity of this 'test' is so patent that there is no need to linger over it here, especially as its manifest unsuitability has been carefully analyzed elsewhere<sup>7</sup>. Really it is a wonder that a reputable journal will give space to such drivel as this 'test'.

Unless I am mistaken, teachers of the Classics themselves are somewhat at fault here. They have been subjected to such a fire of criticism and so menaced with the big stick of the (supposed) findings of psychology that many of them have grown very apologetic, and under the continuous hammering they are hypnotized into thinking that many of the charges may be true.

A case in point is that of the Latin teacher referred to above, who quotes so glibly, and even with a sort of relish, the dismal prognostication that, of all the pupils now studying Latin in the Schools, "probably 99 per cent. . . will never learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term. . .". "I wish to enter a most emphatic protest against this weak and hurtful surrender to the enemy.

Let us look more closely into the question here at issue. Beyond a doubt, acquiring a complete mastery over Latin is no summer afternoon's picnic. Latin is a mine whose lowest depths have not yet been satisfactorily explored. After centuries of study, a multitude of passages remain, which, though apparently sound in text, are yet in meaning a bone of contention among scholars.

To come a little nearer home, I ask the following question: How many teachers, yes, good teachers of High School Latin, who have spent five years or more in that work, would undertake without special preparation to translate at sight any isolated random short passage from the complete works of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, and Ovid? In response to such a call, I do not think that many volunteers would present themselves. But would that mean that Latin does not function? Of course not; it means that, in the matter of translation, Latin does not function *that far*.

Well, then, let us be reasonable in what we expect of children in the Schools. After two or three years of Latin, a boy will not be in a position to pick up Lucretius for light reading after School hours. But our educational friends (who know nothing about the matter) are ready to write down High School Latin a failure, unless it accomplishes some such miracle.

Witness the individual referred to above, who presented to people with as little as one year of instruction in Latin a bit of crabbed modern Latin, abstract in thought, without context, and (to a High School student) strange in structure and diction. Finding them puzzled by the sentence, he raises the joyous paean, "Latin doesn't function, Latin doesn't function"! You might about as well say the same of mathematics, on the ground that a boy who has just completed plane geometry falls down on a problem involving calculus.

In point of translation, Latin 'functions' for the Second Year student, if he can handle at sight simple, clear sentences made up of materials with which he has had a chance to become reasonably familiar; e. g. *Erat una navis Rhodis in dextro cornu Caesaris longe ab reliquis collocata; Cui coactus est Caesar ferre subsidium, ne turpem in conspectu hostium contumeliam acciperet; Quod nisi nox proelium diremisset, tota classe hostium Caesar potitus esset*. These sentences are picked up, as the book opens, at random from the *Bellum Alexandrinum* 11. Possibly *turpem* . . . *contumeliam* and *diremisset* should not be used in a Second Year test; for, as a matter of information, I may state that a student does not *always* remember a thing he has seen but once or twice. But, in a general way, these examples will serve to show what

<sup>4</sup>The Classical Journal 17.54.

<sup>5</sup>A bit of modern Latin written by Arnould.

<sup>6</sup>Theory and Verification, by Joseph Kennedy, School and Society 4.279 ff. (August 19, 1916).

<sup>7</sup>Education 38.460 ff. (February, 1918).

grade of attainment in reading might reasonably be expected of students after two years of good teaching.

To sum up, then, the benefits of a High School course in Latin might be outlined as follows:

(1) Transfer of general training in the matter of habits of perseverance, close observation, power of discrimination, etc.

(2) Enlargement of the mental outlook through the venture into this new field of thought and feeling.

(3) A closer touch with men and things of old; and an entrance (even though slight) into the fellowship of world scholarship.

(4) More or less consciously cultivated by-products, such as insight into the English language, foundation for study of the Romance languages, etc.

(5) A power to read the Latin language commensurate with the time spent in the study.

This is the program where Latin is taught 'as an end in itself', as is the case now almost everywhere. The ideal, of course, is not attained in all Schools, nor with all pupils (but we may note, in passing, that the same thing could be said of all other High School subjects). But it is an ideal well worth working toward; and with certain minor improvements in method we may approximate it more nearly.

Those who believe in maintaining this ideal will do well to watch closely the progress of the Latin Investigation undertaken by the American Classical League. For the bitter attack upon present methods and aims in Latin teaching referred to above is launched with the definite purpose of clearing the way for a very different program, according to which all effort would be discontinued to bring the rank and file of students to a reading power in the language, and the time would be devoted more particularly to the by-products included under number 4 above<sup>a</sup>.

Aside from all other considerations, I venture to call attention here to the fact that it would be extremely poor strategy to greet groups of prospective beginners in Latin with the announcement that they cannot hope to acquire any sort of reading knowledge of the language, even after three or four years of study. For it is entirely natural that children should expect to learn to read Latin, and that they should gauge the success of their efforts very largely by the progress made in that direction.

Decision to hold to the program of studying Latin for the sake of Latin (rather than for the sake of its by-products) does not mean, of course, that some readjustment should not be made (especially under number 4) to make it certain that even the students who enjoy but a brief course shall carry away with them certain tangible benefits.

On the other hand, readjustment of a different kind may be desirable under number 5. At any rate it seems clear that, in the past, the failure of multitudes of students to get upon their feet in the matter of translation was due to the haste with which they were plunged into their first author. With different

treatment at this point, many who now fail might be brought on safely to real reading power.

A hopeful sign of the times is to be seen in the growing favor with which many are regarding the proposal to lengthen the period devoted to 'beginning Latin', thus making it possible to preface Caesar with a considerable amount of easier reading.

It is unfortunate that no Roman author of the classical period has bequeathed to us just the sort of material best suited to this purpose. But, on the other hand, the prejudice against adapted and made Latin has in great measure abated; and, with controlled vocabulary and syntax, it is no impossible task to construct a ladder along which the student may proceed with confidence and a feeling of success to the more difficult reading to be found in his first author.

In any case, we are likely soon to be confronted with a sharp issue. Shall we continue to teach Latin for the sake of Latin, making special provision for those who do not carry the subject far, and, in addition, perfecting the means of developing reading power? Or, for the rank and file of students, shall we frankly give up any attempt to teach them to read the language, making of the Latin course a 'Modern School' factory for intensive production along the lines indicated under number 4?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

## REVIEW

The Laws of Plato. The Text, Edited with Introduction, Notes, Etc. Two Volumes. By E. B. England. Manchester: At the University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. (1921). Pp. 641, 669.

To edit the Laws of Plato as Mr. England has done is a task worth while, and his work deserves a welcome. It is, he reminds us, the only complete edition of this dialogue with an English commentary. Editions of separate books are rare. Seventy-five years ago, an American scholar, Tayler Lewis, under the title *Plato Against the Atheists*, published as a College text-book an edition of Book 10. He chose this book because it seemed to him to be "the best central position from whence to make excursions over a large part of the Platonic philosophy". Certain famous passages from the Laws occur in our text editions of selections from Plato; but in general it is true that one who would read the Laws reads the plain text or Jowett. The publication of this edition constitutes an invitation to read, in the original, this much neglected work.

Mr. England has done for the Laws what James Adam did for the Republic, in that he has furnished an edition of the dialogue entire, in moderate compass and with a scholarly commentary. One could wish that he had followed the current practice of putting text and notes on the same page. Even the textual notes are not given under the text. Practical considerations may have been decisive here, for Mr.

<sup>a</sup>The Classical Journal 17.52 ff.